

Date: Thu, 20 Oct 94 04:30:16 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #496  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 20 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    496

Today's Topics:

                    Code Debate 10/23/94 (2 msgs)  
                    Even a blind pig finds an acorn now and then  
                    One great leap to Packet  
                    Packet on CB Freq??  
                    Re: CW QSO Content

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Wed, 19 Oct 1994 14:53:33 GMT  
From: lenwink@indirect.com (Len Winkler)  
Subject: Code Debate 10/23/94

-----  
Date: Wed, 19 Oct 1994 19:19:00 GMT  
From: jholly@cup.hp.com (Jim Hollenback)  
Subject: Code Debate 10/23/94

Len Winkler (lenwink@indirect.com) wrote:  
>  
>

Yes, Len, that about sums up the total intellegent comments made  
during the great Code Wars.

Jim, WA6SDM  
jholly@cup.hp.com

-----  
Date: Thu, 20 Oct 1994 05:45:01 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)  
Subject: Even a blind pig finds an acorn now and then

I am taking the liberty of reposting Dave's article from .misc,  
for his article contains several good points (I especially like  
the last paragraph!).

Jeff NH6IL

\*\*\*\*\*Begin Included Article\*\*\*\*\*

Article: 66777 of rec.radio.amateur.misc  
From: djenkins@jetson.uh.edu (David Jenkins)  
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc  
Subject: Even a blind pig finds an acorn now and then

Well, I waltzed on down to the testing location on Saturday past,  
intending to take the 5 wpm test. The examiner lobbied me heavily to take  
the 13 wpm, saying that it would make the 5 seem slow and easy. I took  
the 13, and passed with 100% on the questions (not near that well on the  
copy, but I got enough, I guess...) What a deal!

Fired me up so much that I put up a 130' dipole on Saturday, and put  
myself on the air. I actually got someone to talk to me, and they didn't  
lose their patience! All the way from Ark! What a trip--I'm *\*still\**  
fired up.

As a result of my very brief experience so far, I've got a question: in  
my other two contacts, the other party sent so fast that I could hardly  
copy anything. When it was my turn, I asked him (her?) to QRS, but that  
seemed to turn them off, and they said "let's QRT," (blaming it on QRM,  
which might, or might not, have been the case) which they promptly did  
before I could get a name, location, or any other meaningful interchange  
going. Question: is there some CW protocol that would allow an  
interruption of a message in progress in order to get the other party  
to slow down? It seems to me that what probably gets these folks hacked  
is that they spent a lot of time keying in a nice long informative  
message, and this new kid comes along and says the he (I) didn't get  
hardly *\*any\** of it. From their point of view, that's not a very  
satisfying interchange.

I did notice that I seemd to be sending my callsign interchanges faster than I was ready to copy, so I have deliberately slowed that down in the hopes that it will convey to possible contacts the speed at which I'm prepared to copy.

You know, I \*swore\* that I wouldn't like CW, that it was anachronistic and technically obsolete. All that notwithstanding, I think it's going to be a helluva lot of fun! I have a borrowed QRP rig, an antenna, and a desire to communicate--all advice is appreciated...

David F. Jenkins  
Decision and Information Sciences  
University of Houston  
KC5JRR

-----  
Date: 19 Oct 94 16:42:00 GMT  
From: sayyed.garba@totrbbs.atl.ga.us (Sayyed Garba)  
Subject: One great leap to Packet

Hi Fellows,  
I am one of the thousands of Ham Licence holders with unused call signs. I really feel guilty for not utilizing the priviledge associated with having the licence, as such I am taking a bold step to enter into Packet radio. Could any of you 'Ham Gurus' involved with Packet Radio give me a chance to have a hands-on session as an eye opener ?.

I have had my tech. licence for the last three years and could not afford the gear required for a Packet Radio. I am now kind of ready to take the first step and then invest on the gear and see what is really going on. My ultimate goal? delve into satelllite comm if possible

I will appreciate help from any one!

Your 'Baby ham friend'.

----  
Top Of The Rock BBS - Lilburn, GA                   SYSOP: Steve Diggs  
UUCP: totrbbs.atl.ga.us                   Snailmail: 4181 Wash Lee Ct.  
Phone: +1 404 921 8687                   Lilburn, GA 30247-7407

-----  
Date: Wed, 19 Oct 1994 15:16:24 UNDEFINED  
From: n7slx@primenet.com (John Mitchell)

Subject: Packet on CB Freq??

I heard packet on a local CB channel, is it legal to operate packet on these freq??

J.Mitchell

-----  
Date: Wed, 19 Oct 1994 18:39:20 GMT  
From: Earl=Morse%EMC=Srcv%Eng=Hou@bangate.compaq.com  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

>By the way, add to the techs and novices those of us with  
>general/advanced/extra class licenses that see no reason  
>to continue testing on a pass/fail basis for 13/20wpm and  
>the prospect of an overwhelming shift of attitude and comment  
>is even more likely.  
>

I don't think that all those codeless tech are going to want codeless HF access. Quite a few will want to keep HF access on a know code basis only.

Many new hams view the codeless tech license as an easy springboard into the hobby and they intend to upgrade by learning the code.

Just as incentive licensing was meant to be.

Earl Morse  
KZ8E  
kz8e@bangate.compaq.com

-----  
Date: 19 Oct 1994 22:37:39 GMT  
From: steve@sheridan.ncd.com (Steve Wilson)

References<37kfob\$4k@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> <1994Oct17.194607.27017@arrl.org>,  
<37va9s\$b6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>  
Subject: ARRL Dues(Or why pay em?)

In article <37va9s\$b6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

|> In article <1994Oct17.194607.27017@arrl.org>,  
|> Ed Hare (KA1CV) <ehare@arrl.org> wrote:  
|> >Dr. Michael Mancini (mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:  
|> >  
|> >: The League has welcomed these "new" amateurs with open arms. And why not?

|> >: At \$30 a head, they represent some serious cash flow. Even though the  
|> >: League is a non-profit organization, most of the officers at Newington  
|> >: still draw handsome salaries.  
|> >  
|> >Belive what you will, but when I "welcome them with open arms" it is because  
|> >I believe that ARRL needs to represent all of Amateur Radio or we will lose  
|> >our effectiveness to represent any of it.  
|>  
|> If your membership fees were reduced to \$15.00 a year, or even \$7.50 a year,  
|> do you think it would represent more of the amateur population? I realize  
|> that the bulk of the dues covers the expense of a subscription to QST, but  
|> I'm sure there are many people out there (such as me) who really aren't  
|> interested in that, but desire to become members.

Okay, I'm going to do this from memory, so if someone has BETTER figures,  
then go ahead and quote em!

First off, the current membership dues covers only about 30% of the operating  
costs, this includes publishing QST and all of the other league  
activities(both publishing and field programs). The vast majority of  
league expenses are covered by the publishing operation profits!

Also, to second Ed's point, all of the elected officers of ARRL, i.e. Directors,  
Section Managers, as well as the VP's and President(with the notable exception  
of the Mr. Sumner) receive NO pay. The staff folks are compensated for their  
efforts, but the pay scale isn't comparable to industry(at least not in my  
part of the country...) by a large margin!

Michael, you complain about the price of dues. This is like just about  
every other ham I know. We, collectively, are the cheapest form of life  
on the face of the planet! To illustrate the point, the local division  
convention had problems for years because they were charging \$12 for  
entry into a 2 day event. TWELVE dollars...that's all! I paid almost that  
much to take my first amateur test at FCC mumblity-mumble years ago!  
I personally believe that \$30 is a pauptry sum in comparison to the  
services provided, while ignoring the fact that you receive QST for that \$30..  
that's just icing on the cake!

If the dues were set at \$15, you or someone like you would complain about  
THAT being too much. It really doesn't seem to matter what number you choose,  
someone is going to bitch about it.

Now, let's look at the history of the price increases for dues over the last \$20  
or so years. I don't remember the exact years these increases occured..(it's all  
a blur ;-)) but something like:

1978 - \$9

1981 - \$25 (Now that was a whopper!

1990 - \$30

The last increase was only incremental compared to increase that occurred in the early 80s. And from another perspective, they did a good job of controlling costs since there was something like a 9 year period between dues hikes!

Even if you ONLY considered the value of QST, how many magazines do you receive that are in the \$25-\$30 a year category? Quite a few are charging this amount. If you were to receive some professional organization rags like IEEE Spectrum.....try \$100 plus! Even QST looks like quite a deal in comparison!

|>  
|> Yes, I agree that the ARRL needs to represent "all" of amateur radio, but  
|> the truth is that it doesn't. Rather, it usually represents the majority  
|> of its membership, and often the League just represents the League.  
|>  
|> Case in point: I was recently at a convention, in which I asked one of the  
|> League Directors a few questions. His first response to me was an inquiry  
|> as to whether I was a League member or not. When I said no, he promptly  
|> told me to stop wasting his time.

Well, from his perspective as a politician that makes a lot of sense. And from my perspective as a member, why should you get the benefits of influencing the decision making in an organization you aren't a member of. You receive many of the fringe benefits of league operations for free...while I shoulder the burden of paying for it. Why should someone who is free-loading have political influence. No...I don't agree with you here. Pay the tab or don't take the cab!

|>  
|> Now, I recognize that this probably doesn't represent the "official League  
|> HQ" feeling on this matter, but still, if you seek to represent all of  
|> amateur radio, you must LISTEN to all radio amateurs. Do you agree?  
|>

Well, if a director said it... it might as well!

Steve KA6S

-----

Date: Thu, 20 Oct 1994 05:59:59 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<wa4zos-1410941323510001@seadog.lib.muohio.edu>  
<782497263snz@g4kfk.demon.co.uk>, <19940ct19.113659.11823@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>

Reply-To: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu  
Subject: Re: Kindness and ham radio

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

.....  
>I fail to see why you should complain if stations want to exchange  
>QSL cards to acknowledge an unusual contact made through a repeater.  
>They may prize it as much as you do your score tokens.

Hey Gary, why is it that here on .policy you condemn HF ops who exchange  
QSL cards by calling them 'post card collectors' yet on .misc it's FB to  
exchange them for DX repeater contacts?

Jeff NH6IL

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #496

\*\*\*\*\*